UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,847	05/31/2005	Maarten Peter Bodlaender	NL 021307	4715

24737   7590   05/28/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
GOEL, DINESH K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 May 2005*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 May 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☒ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/9/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of

the claim "….said first device (A) comprises….." should be replaced by "….said first

device (B) comprises…..". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267), and further in view of Glassen et

al (U.S. Patent Number 5,671,441).

Referring to claim 1, Dustan teaches (Figure 5, Paragraph 0029) a method for a first

communication device (B) (reads host) of maintaining an up-to-date configuration

description of a second communication device (A), said first device (B) comprises a

storage medium and is adapted for storing on said storage medium configuration

descriptions being uniquely identified by a configuration identifier (C#), the method

comprises the steps of:

receiving (701) from the second device A information comprising a configuration

identifier (C#) uniquely identifying the configuration of the second device (A) ("515" or

"510" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

checking (703) whether the configuration description identified by the received

configuration identifier (C#) is already stored on the storage medium ("520" in Figure 5,

Paragraph 0029),

if said configuration description is already stored on the storage medium, setting

(705) the configuration description corresponding to the received configuration identifier

(C#) as the active configuration description of the second device (A) ("530" and "535" in

Figure 5, Paragraph 0029).

However, Dustan does not teach that if said configuration description identified

by the configuration identifier (C#) is not stored on the storage medium, requesting and

receiving (707) the configuration description specifically from said second device (A). It

only teaches (Paragraph 0031) storing said configuration description together with said

configuration identifier (C#) on said storage medium and setting (709) the configuration

corresponding to the received configuration identifier (C#) as the active configuration

description of the second device (A).

Glassen et al teach (Column 8, Lines 29-33) a method for identifying I/O devices.

They teach a method of requesting and receiving the configuration data from the I/O.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan with the teachings of Glassen et al.

The motivation would have been to employ a method so that the configuration and

service data could be obtained directly from the device and would be stored for

controlling the device.

Referring to claim 2, Glassen et al further teach (Column 3, Lines 41-45, 51-57) a

method wherein the unique configuration identifier (C#) comprises an identification of

the second device (A).

Referring to claim 4, Glassen et al further teach (Column 10, Lines 36-39) a method

wherein the configuration identifier (C#) is a device specific configuration number

uniquely identifying the configuration of the device.

Referring to claim 8, it is an apparatus claim which corresponds to the method claim 1.

As such this is also rejected.

4.   Claim 7 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267), and in view of Glassen et al (U.S.

Patent Number 5671441), and further in view of Manni et al (U.S. Patent Number

7194689).

Referring to claim 7, Dunstan and Glassen et al do not specifically teach that the first

device (B) is a control point in an UPnP network, and the second device (A) is an UPnP

device being part of the UPnP network.

However, Manni et al teach (Column 7 Lines 42-46) where device (B) would be a user control point and device (A) would be a UPnP device in a UPnP network configuration.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan with the teachings of Manni et al. The motivation would have been to use already available UPnP networking technology to be able to discover various devices, browsing their properties, selecting their services, and controlling them.

Referring to claim 3, Dunstan and Glassen et al do not specifically teach that the configuration description comprises an identification of the services offered by the second device (A).

However, Manni et al further teach (Column 3 Lines 39-49) that the configuration description of the device comprises an identification of services offered by the device.

5.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267), and in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441), and further in view of Mikuriya (U.S. Patent Number 6728633).

Referring to claim 5, Dunstan and Glassen et al do not teach a method wherein the configuration descriptions on the storage medium, which have not been accessed for the longest time period, are deleted from the storage medium.

Mikuriya et al teach (Column 15, Lines 18-25) such a method of deleting the

oldest data from the storage device which would also be applied here.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan and Glassen et al with the teachings

of Mikuriya et al. The motivation would have been to provide a method where the old

records can be removed from the memory which have not been used for the longest

period of time, so that the memory space would be utilized more efficiently.

6.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan

(US Publication Number 2003/0061267), and in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent

Number 5671441), and further in view of Obrink (International Publication Number WO

00/49944).

Referring to claim 6, Dunstan and Glassen et al do not teach a method wherein the

second device generates the configuration identifier (C#) by deriving it from the

configuration description using fingerprinting.

Obrink teaches (Page 8 Lines 12-33) a method of using finger printing and

creating digital representation.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan and Glassen et al with the teachings of

Obrink. The motivation would have been to provide a method where finger printing

identification would be used to identify a person for access control.

7.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan

(US Publication Number 2003/0061267), and in view of Manni et al (U.S. Patent

Number 7194689), and further in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441).

Referring to claim 9, Dustan teaches (Figure 5, Paragraph 0029) a method for a host

communication device for maintaining an up-to-date configuration description of a

second communication device, said host comprises a storage medium and is adapted

for storing on said storage medium configuration descriptions being uniquely identified

by a configuration identifier, the host comprises:

Means for receiving from the second device information comprising a

configuration identifier uniquely identifying the configuration of the second device ("515"

or "510" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

Means for checking whether the configuration description identified by the

received configuration identifier is already stored on the storage medium ("520" in

Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

Means for, if said configuration description is already stored on the storage

medium, setting the configuration description corresponding to the received

configuration identifier as the active configuration description of the second device

("530" and "535" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029).

However, Dustan does not teach that the host device is a UPnP control point and

the second device is UPnP device.

Manni et al teach (Column 7 Lines 42-46) where the host device would be a user

control point and the second device would be a UPnP device in a UPnP network

configuration.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan with the teachings of

Manni et al. The motivation would have been to use already available UPnP networking

technology to be able to discover various devices, browsing their properties, selecting

their services, and controlling them.

Also, Dustan does not specifically teach that if said configuration description

identified by the configuration identifier is not stored on the storage medium, requesting

and receiving the configuration description from said device (UPnP device as taught by

by Manni et al). It only teaches (Paragraph 0031) storing said configuration description

together with said configuration identifier on said storage medium and setting the

configuration corresponding to the received configuration identifier as the active

configuration description of the second device (taught as UPnP device by Manni et al).

Glassen et al teach (Column 8, Lines 29-33) a method for identifying I/O devices.

They teach a method of requesting and receiving the configuration data from the I/O.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan and Manni et al with the teachings of Glassen et al. The motivation would have been to employ a method so that the configuration and service data could be obtained directly from the device and would be stored for controlling the device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DINESH GOEL whose telephone number is (571)270-5201. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lun Yi Lao can be reached on 571-272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 4134

/Yogesh K Aggarwal/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622